Application No.: 10/080,763

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

A separate "LETTER TO DRAFTSMAN SUBMITTING NEW

DRAWINGS" is being submitted.

Application No.: 10/080,763

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 23, 2005 has been carefully reviewed. Reconsideration of this application, as amended and in view of the enclosed Declarations and the following remarks, is respectfully requested. The claims presented for examination are: claims 1-31.

Objections to the Drawings

In numbered paragraph 4 of the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The statement was made, "Fig. 6 is neither a commonly accepted block diagram showing the structural relationship of system components nor a flow chart showing the function steps; block 62 is a system component but not a functional step and block 65 is a functional step but not a system component."

Applicant is submitting a revised version of FIG. 6 that is a flow chart showing function steps. The revised version of FIG. 6 changes the system component terminology to functional step terminology. Applicant believes this overcomes the objection to the drawing.

35 USC 112 Rejections

In numbered paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, claims 1–31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The statement was made, "The term 'acceptable' in claims 1, 4, 8, 17, and 23 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term 'acceptable' is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope to the invention."

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 8, 17, and 23 to replace the term "acceptable" so that the phrase now reads: "resulting in any distortion in said

view being reduced." The amended claims 1, 4, 8, 17, and 23 are no longer indefinite.

Allowable Subject Matter

In numbered paragraph 20 of the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, claims 13, 22, 25, and 27 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten the parent claims of each of the allowable claims to incorporate all of the limitations of the allowable claim and all intervening claims. This places the independent claims in allowable form. Since all of the independent claims are now in allowable form, all of the independent claims presented for examination are now in condition for allowance.

In numbered paragraphs 11 through 19 of the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005, claims 1-12, 14-21, 23, 24, 26, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the primary West et al reference (US 6,339,434) in view of the secondary Melen reference (US 6,320,979) and the tertiary Morota et al reference (US 6,919,921.). Since Applicant has rewritten the parent claims of each of the allowable claims to incorporate all of the limitations of the allowable claim and all intervening claims, the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection no longer applies.

Application No.: 10/080,763

SUMMARY

The undersigned respectfully submits that, in view of the foregoing amendments and the foregoing remarks, the rejections of the claims raised in the Office Action dated August 23, 2005 have been fully addressed and overcome, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, that the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed to issue. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (925) 424-6897.

Respectfully submitted,

Eddie E. Scott

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 25,220

Tel. No. (925) 424-6897

Livermore, California

Dated: November 17, 2005